



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,817	10/17/2003	Raymond S. Duley	5500-99300	2372
35690	7590	06/13/2005		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398				
			EXAMINER NORRIS, JEREMY C	
			ART UNIT 2841	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,817

Applicant(s)

DULEY, RAYMOND S.

Examiner

Jeremy C. Norris

Art Unit

2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 7-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/7/05; 3/29/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 14-27 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The original invention concerns integrated circuits mounted on a circuit board which is properly classified in class 174 subclass 260. However, the invention of claims 14-27 concern components mounted to a circuit board and further a second circuit board mounted on the first circuit board. This invention would be properly classified in class 361 subclass 784. Moreover, the invention of claims 14-27 and the originally presented claims are related a combination subcombination. Additionally, since the combination does not require the particulars of the subcombination (no integrated circuits are claimed) and the subcombination has separate utility as a power board on its own, restriction would be proper.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 14-27 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2841

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,239,485 (hereafter Peters).

Peters discloses, referring to primarily to figure 1, a component comprising: one or more integrated circuits (104) and a component package (100) to which the one or more integrated circuits are coupled, the component package having a bottom comprising a plurality of conductors (Z-connections) for providing signal connection to the one or more integrated circuits, a top to which the one or more integrated circuits are coupled, and a plurality of sides, wherein at least one of the plurality of sides includes at least one power pad (108) for providing a power supply voltage to the one or more integrated circuits and wherein at least one of the plurality of sides includes at least one ground pad (500) for providing a ground to the one or more integrated circuits (col. 3, lines 60-68) wherein both the at least one power pad and the at least one ground pad are exposed for direct physical contact with conductors external to the component package to supply the power supply voltage and the ground to the one or more integrated circuit during use [claim 1] wherein the component package comprises one or more power planes and one or more ground planes (col. 4, lines 10-25), wherein each of the power planes is coupled to the power pad and each of the ground planes is coupled to the ground pad (col. 4, lines 10-25) [claim 2], wherein each of the power planes is insulated from the ground pad, and wherein each of the ground planes is insulated from the power pad [claim 3] wherein the component package comprises a circuit board, and wherein the power planes and the ground planes comprise layers in

Art Unit: 2841

the circuit board (col. 5, lines 15-40) [claim 4], wherein each of the plurality of sides includes at least one pad (col. 4, lines 10-25) [claim 5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters.

Peters discloses the claimed invention as described above except Peters does not specifically teach "wherein each of the plurality of sides includes at least one power pad and at least one ground pad. However, Peters does state that a set of connection pads may be used on each edge (col. 4, lines 10-25). One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that each side could contain both a ground and a power pad. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to provide a ground and a power connection of each of the plurality of edges. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a built-in redundancy for each type of connection, making the device more resistant to failure.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-13 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 7 states the limitation "a circuit board configured to be placed over a top of the component, the circuit board including a bottom side that faces the component during use, the bottom side of the second circuit board comprising a first plurality of conductive pads to be electrically coupled to the power and ground pads on the component to supply power and ground connection to the component". This limitation, in conjunction with the other claimed limitations was neither found to be disclosed in, nor suggested by the prior art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that figure 1 of Peters does not display both a

Art Unit: 2841

ground pad and a power pad, but rather both edge connections 108, and 500 are connected to ground. However, in focusing solely on the illustrations, Applicant has failed to appreciate the broader disclosure of Peters. Peters specifically states "edges connectors 500 may be used to electrically connect different ground layers...., different power layers... , or the power/ground layer of the signal core to other ground or power layers of the interposer. The ordinarily skilled artisan would readily comprehend this Peters to disclose any combination of uses for the connectors including, but certainly not limited to using one such edge connection for ground and another such edge connection for power, since Peters lists these options in the alternative. Thus, the traversal of the rejection on these grounds is deemed unsuccessful.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2841

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeremy C. Norris whose telephone number is 571-272-1932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:30 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCSN


KAMAND CUNEO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800